

ALONG THE SOCIALIST OR THE CAPITALIST ROAD?

by the Editorial Departments of *Hongqi* and *Renmin Ribao*

COMMENTS ON TAO CHU'S TWO BOOKS

by YAO WEN-YUAN

Supplement to CHINA RECONSTRUCTS, November 1967

ALONG THE SOCIALIST OR THE CAPITALIST ROAD?

by the Editorial Departments of *Hongqi* (Red Flag)
and *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily)

CHINA in the present era is the focal point of contradictions in the world, the storm centre of the world revolution.

Whither China? Will it take the socialist road or the capitalist road? This is not only a fundamental issue of Chinese politics, it concerns the destiny of the world proletarian revolution.

For some decades now, a fierce struggle has gone on within the Chinese Communist Party over this fundamental issue, a struggle between two diametrically opposed lines, at each historical stage of the development of the Chinese revolution and at each crucial moment of revolutionary change.

One line maintains that the Chinese revolution must be led by the proletariat, that it must pass from the stage of the new democratic revolution to the stage of the socialist revolution, that the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat must be carried through to the end and that its ultimate goal is communism. This is the proletarian revolutionary line represented by our great leader Chairman Mao.

The other line liquidates the proletarian leadership of the Chinese revolution, practises bourgeois reformism, and, in the stage of socialism, opposes the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and takes the capitalist road, that is, the dark, old road that would lead China back to semi-colonial, semi-feudal society. This is the bourgeois reactionary line pursued in succession by Chen Tu-hsiu, Chu Chiu-pai, Li Li-san, Wang Ming and Chang Kuo-tao right down to the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road. And this person represents this reactionary line in its most concentrated form.

The two diametrically opposed lines lead to two entirely opposite prospects, two entirely opposite destinies for the Chinese revolution. It is precisely in the course of the struggle between these two lines that, guided by our great leader Chairman Mao, the Chinese revolution has hacked its way forward through all the difficulties and advanced victoriously.

The essence of this struggle has been the question of which road China should take. Its focal

point has always been a matter of political power, a question of which class should exercise dictatorship.

(1)

Our great leader Chairman Mao teaches us: In the stage of the democratic revolution, the focal point of the programme of the Chinese Communist Party is the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes led by the proletariat; in the stage of the socialist revolution, the focal point of the programme of the Chinese Communist Party is the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the people's democratic dictatorship.

The question raised by Chairman Mao at the very beginning of his great work *On New Democracy* is: **Whither China?** In this brilliant Marxist-Leninist work, he sums up the historical experience of the Chinese revolution and the world revolution in an all-round, penetrating and systematic way, scientifically formulates the political, economic and cultural programmes for the new democratic revolution, and clearly and thoroughly charts the road of transition from the new democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. He says: **"The first step or stage in our revolution is definitely not, and cannot be, the establishment of a capitalist society under the dictatorship of the Chinese bourgeoisie, but will result in the establishment of a new-democratic society under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes of China headed by the Chinese proletariat. The revolution will then be carried forward to the second stage, in which a socialist society will be established in China."**

Chairman Mao sharply refuted the fallacious reactionary theory which calls for a futile attempt to establish the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in China. He explicitly pointed out that, judging by China's international and internal situation, anyone who dreamed of establishing a capitalist society, a society under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, would eventually find himself in the lap of imperialism, with the result that China would again be-

come a colony or semi-colony and part of the reactionary world under imperialism. Here Chairman Mao was pungently refuting not merely the Right-opportunist Wang Ming whose notorious reputation had long been established but also the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who has now been exposed.

This top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road is a seasoned opportunist and revisionist, a representative of the bourgeoisie who has sneaked into our Party.

Back in the early twenties, he was already singing the very same tune as the renegade Chen Tu-hsiu. He viciously attacked the proletarian revolutionaries, saying that the seizure of political power "of course cannot be carried out right now by such a juvenile proletariat, judging by the present situation in China. Since it is a matter of the distant future, there is no need to waste words discussing it."¹

Soon after Chiang Kai-shek's "April 12" counter-revolutionary coup, he followed the renegade Chen Tu-hsiu in ordering the workers' pickets in Wuhan to hand thousands of rifles over to the Kuomintang. Furthermore, he himself appeared at a meeting called by the Workers' Affairs Department of the Central Committee of the Kuomintang and reported to it about the so-called "significance and course of the voluntary disbandment of workers' pickets by the Hupeh Provincial General Council of Trade Unions".²

After the publication of Chairman Mao's *On New Democracy*, he went out of his way to attack Chairman Mao directly, singing a tune entirely opposed to *On New Democracy*. He went so far as to praise Chiang Kai-shek as "the banner of the revolution" and declared: "I think the Chinese revolution can be carried out under the banner of the Three People's Principles of the Kuomintang—at least in the present stage of democratic revolution it will move ahead much more smoothly under this banner than under any other."³ He asked spitefully: "Why don't we say that we are carrying out the Three People's Principles instead of obstinately working out something else?"⁴ Here this old opportunist showed himself up completely as a renegade opposing and selling out the revolution!

After the War of Resistance Against Japan was won, U.S. imperialism made use of its lackey Chiang Kai-shek and tried to convert China into its own exclusive colony. At that juncture the Chinese people were engaged in a life-and-death struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism. This was a great battle that was decisive for the choice between the two destinies, two prospects for China. The question of state power confronted the proletariat in a still more acute way. In good time Chairman Mao pointed this out to the whole Party and the people throughout the country.

In his brilliant speech *The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan*, Chairman Mao pointed out: "From now on the struggle will be, build what sort of country? To build a new-democratic country of the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat? Or to build a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country under the dictatorship of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie? This will be a most complicated struggle. At present it takes the form of a struggle between Chiang Kai-shek who is trying to usurp the fruits of victory of the War of Resistance and ourselves who oppose his usurpation. If there is any opportunism during this period, it will lie in failing to struggle hard and in making a voluntary gift to Chiang Kai-shek of the fruits which should go to the people." Chairman Mao also pointed out: "Chiang Kai-shek always tries to wrest every ounce of power and every ounce of gain from the people. And we? Our policy is to give him tit for tat and to fight for every inch of land", and "as Chiang Kai-shek is now sharpening his swords, we must sharpen ours too".

It was none other than the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road whom Chairman Mao was criticizing and repudiating here as representing opportunism. Once again this old opportunist had systematically set out his national capitulationist and class capitulationist line of opposing and selling out the revolution, at the historical juncture of the great battle decisive for the choice between two destinies, between two prospects, for China. He asserted that "at present the main form of the struggle of the Chinese revolution has become peaceful and parliamentary; it is a legal mass struggle and a parliamentary struggle."⁵ He wanted our Party to hand over all our armed forces and arms to Chiang Kai-shek so that they "become units of the national army, national defence army, security troops and self-defence forces" and "to liquidate Party organizations" in the army. He demanded that our Party "stop its direct leadership and command of the armed forces, which should be placed under the unified command of the ministry of national defence"⁶ (that is, the Kuomintang's ministry of national defence). In doing all this, what he really had in mind was to get slicked up and present himself to Chiang Kai-shek, hoping thereby to win favour in his eyes. He even had the effrontery to say that we should "be able to run for election and get people to vote for us" and that "we are now one of the government parties (that is, parties of the Kuomintang government); we are no longer in opposition but in power, and some people will enter the ranks of officialdom. We had some official positions in the central government in 1927 which were lost when they started fighting. This time the positions will not be lost if fighting starts."⁷ What a confession of his innermost secret desire!

Traitors to the proletariat, the Right-wing socialists and old-line revisionists, Bernstein and

Kautsky und their like, all preached the parliamentary road, opposed revolution by violence, betrayed the interests of the proletariat and became ornaments and accomplices of the bourgeois reactionary regimes. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road is a bird of the same feather! If there is any difference, it is this—he was prepared to hand over the people's political power and the people's army with both hands at a time when China's proletariat had an army of more than 1,200,000 and a people's regime was established in areas with a total population of more than 130 million. This makes his advocacy of wholesale capitulation and betrayal all the more despicable and vicious!

At the very moment when the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road was attempting to sell out the fruits of victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan, leaders of the "communist parties" of France and Italy, such as Thorez and Togliatti, were making a political deal with the bourgeoisie by bartering away the fruits of victory won by the people at the cost of blood and sacrifice. They handed over to the bourgeoisie several hundred thousand weapons—the revolutionary arms of the proletariat—in exchange for vice-premierships and other such official positions of the bourgeois state, and became men who will go down in history as criminals! At this historical turning point, our great leader Chairman Mao told us: "The arms of the people, every gun and every bullet, must all be kept, must not be handed over." "The rights the people have won must never be lightly given up but must be defended by fighting." "If they [the Kuomintang] fight, we will wipe them out completely." With heroic proletarian courage, our great leader Chairman Mao successfully resisted the worldwide adverse current of capitulationism—"the handing over of the guns"—and dared to fight on and win victory, so setting a brilliant example for proletarian revolutionaries throughout the world. Thus the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung demonstrated its boundless power.

It was precisely under Chairman Mao's wise leadership that our Party, our people and our army took the correct direction, took firm hold of the gun, broke through all resistance, marched forward triumphantly along the high road of revolution, and finally won their great victory in the people's War of Liberation and founded the People's Republic of China. It was a merciless verdict passed by history on the class capitulationism and national capitulationism of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road!

(2)

The founding of the People's Republic of China pushed history forward to a new stage, that is, from that of the new democratic revolution to that of the

socialist revolution. At that moment, the struggle between the two lines was focused on which road New China which was just founded should take—the socialist or the capitalist road? In the final analysis, this struggle was over the question of whether the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie would be exercised in China.

On the eve of nationwide victory in the new democratic revolution, Chairman Mao pointed out clearly in his brilliant work *Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China*: "After the country-wide victory of the Chinese revolution and the solution of the land problem, two basic contradictions will still exist in China. The first is internal, that is, the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie. The second is external, that is, the contradiction between China and the imperialist countries. Consequently, after the victory of the people's democratic revolution, the state power of the people's republic under the leadership of the working class must not be weakened but must be strengthened."

Later, in his speech on the Party's general line for the transition period Chairman Mao pointed out: "The founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949, marked the conclusion in the main of the stage of the new democratic revolution and the beginning of the stage of the socialist revolution. He said: "The general line and general task of the Party during this transition period is gradually to bring about the socialist industrialization of the country and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce by the state over a fairly long period. This general line is the beacon light which illuminates all aspects of our work. If we depart from it in any aspect of our work, we will commit Right or 'Left' mistakes."

At such a time of great new change, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road once again stepped forward as the spokesman of the bourgeoisie to pit himself against Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. He went around flagrantly campaigning for the development of capitalism in town and country. He raised the slogan, "struggle for the consolidation of the new democratic system".⁸ He talked nonsense, saying that "in China, there is not too much capitalism, but too little"; "it is necessary to develop capitalist exploitation, for such exploitation is progressive"⁹; "the more you exploit, the greater your merit will be" and "such historic merit will be engraved for all time".¹⁰ He stood for the development and long-term protection of the rich peasant economy in the rural areas. And he still put forward the reactionary line of developing capitalism and establishing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in China even

after his plans for a bourgeois republic went completely bankrupt.

The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road did his utmost to oppose China's taking the socialist road. He said: "It will be a very long time before China takes really serious socialist steps."¹¹ It would take 20 years, or 30 years, although there were different estimates, but in any case there would be some scores of years of collaboration with the capitalists, first to realize industrialization, then to undertake the nationalization of industry and the collectivization of agriculture. He said: "When in the future industrialization is realized and there are more factories and more products, that is when socialism should be embarked upon."¹² Summing it up, he said: "When in the future China has industrial over-production that will be the time for her to embark on socialism."¹³ "When in the future China has industrial over-production"—what a remark! Industrial over-production is a characteristic of capitalism. This remark of his right away exposed his ambition to develop capitalism. The sort of things he peddled were actually not new, but a rehash of the "theory of productive forces" rubbish put forward by the old-line revisionists including Trotsky, Bukharin and Rykov, and smashed by Lenin and Stalin at an early stage after the founding of the Soviet Union. He completely denied the role played by the dictatorship of the proletariat and the advanced socialist relations of production in promoting the growth of the productive forces. He completely denied the fact that the worker-peasant masses are the creators of social wealth and are the true motive force pushing forward the development of history. In his eyes there were only Messrs. Capitalists. With all his heart he desired to rely on them to achieve "immortal exploits" and to build his "utopia"!

What kind of "socialism" was he speaking about? Please note the following fantastic statement he made. He said: "Now, in the stage of new democracy, you capitalists can bring your initiative into full play. And what should you do in the future when we have crossed over to socialism? Last time when I talked to Mr. Sung Fei-ching (Sung Fei-ching was manager of the Tungya Woollen Mill, a diehard counter-revolutionary whom the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road lauded to the skies after liberation and who, shortly afterwards, fled abroad—Ed.), I said: 'Now you run only one factory. In the future, you can run two, three . . . eight factories. When the country makes the transition to socialism, you can hand the factories over to the state on the latter's order, or the state will buy them up; if the state has no money temporarily, it can issue bonds. Then the state will still entrust the running of the eight factories to you and you will remain the manager, but a manager of state factories. As you are capable you will be given

eight more factories, altogether you will be entrusted with 16 factories to run. Your salary will not be reduced but increased; however, you will have to run them well! Will you do this?' Mr. Sung said: 'Of course I will!' You will be called to a meeting to discuss how to carry through the transformation to socialism. You will certainly not frown, but all of you will come to the meeting with beaming faces."¹⁴

How wonderful! A capitalist sells eight factories to the state and gets back 16 factories from the state. And this is called "socialism"! At that time, a group of capitalists did indeed exclaim "with beaming faces": "In the past we couldn't fathom what the Communist Party had in mind but now we're beginning to learn." And the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road said to them obsequiously: "I'll let you get to the bottom of what the Party has in mind and let you know what you want to know."¹⁵ What true servility! What a genuine offer of service! Haven't the old and new revisionists all talked about "growing into socialism peacefully"? Here indeed was a living sample. And it is they themselves who have truly "grown into" capitalism! Didn't the No. 1 agent of the bourgeoisie who "grew into" our Party thoroughly expose his own ugly face?

In order to hoodwink others, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road also hypocritically talked about the dictatorship of the proletariat, but his dictatorship of the proletariat is fake proletarian and genuine bourgeois dictatorship.

He was bitterly hostile to the working class. He once yelled: "There are also unreliable people in the working class" and "Don't assume there are no problems about relying on the working class."¹⁶ At one stroke he wrote off the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which mainly took the form of restriction and opposition to restriction [of capitalism]. He blatantly asserted: "There must be no restriction for seven or eight years. This is beneficial to the state, the workers and production."¹⁷ He went so far as to advocate: "State-owned and private enterprises should consult together on all questions, from raw materials to marketing, and should jointly decide on their allocation", and he added, "so that all can share in making money."¹⁸ He openly called on the bourgeoisie to "fight" the proletariat. He said: "You must fight the workers. If you fail to do so, don't blame the Communist Party if in the future the workers fight till your factories are ruined."¹⁹ There it is! In his eyes the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat led by the working class has the job of dealing not with the bourgeoisie but with the working class! What is more, he openly said: "Today we do not want dictatorship by one class. We should represent the entire people."²⁰ Is this not out-and-out betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road desperately opposed the socialist transformation of agriculture and sabotaged the development of agricultural cooperation. He disparaged those poor peasants who took the lead in raising the demand to organize themselves as bankrupt "poor peasants who are unable to farm individually."²¹ He described the proposal that the agricultural mutual-aid team should be developed into agricultural cooperatives as "erroneous and dangerous utopian agrarian socialism."²² In collusion with a handful of Right-wing opportunists, he cut down the number of cooperatives on a large scale, and altogether 200,000 agricultural cooperatives were dissolved. He said viciously: "What do we mean by laissez-faire? We mean allowing free hiring of farm hands and freedom for individual farming; if they all have three horses and a plough, that will be very fine. There can be no laissez-faire for those who do not permit the hiring of farm hands or freedom for individual farming! Those who interfere with the 'three horses' proposition are not to be allowed to do as they please!"²³ In this way he gave only to the rich peasants the freedom to develop exploitation, but refused to give the poor and lower-middle peasants the freedom to organize and engage in mutual aid and cooperation. And his futile purpose in all this was to hand the vast countryside over to the rich peasants and turn it into a base for the bourgeoisie to resist the proletariat.

Political power has always been the instrument by which one class oppresses another. If instead of developing socialism, the political power of the new China that had just come into being had developed capitalism, if instead of restricting the bourgeoisie it had restricted the proletariat, if instead of restricting the rich peasants it had restricted the poor peasants, and if instead of struggling against the bourgeoisie it had "struggled" against the proletariat and thereby completely abandoned the function it was called upon to fulfil—that of suppressing the resistance of the bourgeoisie and safeguarding the socialist revolution and socialist construction—would there not have been a fundamental change in the nature of the political power of New China? Chairman Mao hit the nail on the head when he said: "What will happen if our country fails to establish a socialist economy? It will turn into a country like Yugoslavia, a bourgeois state in effect, and the dictatorship of the proletariat will turn into a bourgeois dictatorship and, for that matter, into a reactionary, fascist dictatorship. This question very much warrants our vigilance and I hope comrades will give it serious consideration."

(3)

When the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production has in the main been completed, do classes and class struggle

still exist in socialist society? Should the dictatorship of the proletariat be maintained and the socialist revolution carried through to the end, or should the dictatorship of the proletariat be abolished and the way be paved for the restoration of capitalism? These important theoretical and practical problems were previously unresolved in the history of the international communist movement.

Again, at this crucial historical turning point, our great leader Chairman Mao published his *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, his *Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work* and other works. These brilliant, epoch-making documents summarized the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the world and—for the first time in the history of the development of Marxism—provided a scientific, systematic and penetrating exposition of contradictions, classes and class struggle in socialist society. This was an important landmark signifying that Marxism-Leninism had developed to a completely new stage—the stage of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Chairman Mao clearly pointed out that in socialist society "the class struggle is by no means over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the different political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will continue to be long and tortuous and at times will even become very acute." "There are still a number of people who vainly hope to restore the capitalist system and fight the working class on every front, including the ideological one."

However, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road did his utmost to spread the idea of "the dying out of class struggle". He made such absurd statements as: "In our country, there are no more classes and class struggle. And 'capitalists, landlords and rich peasants will all go into socialism'.²⁴ "After that, there will be no revolutionary struggle, no land reform, nor socialist transformation", "there will be no battleground for heroes to show their prowess, for there will be no landlord class or bourgeoisie for us to wipe out".²⁵

"The dying out of class struggle!" This is a sheer lie. It is the same stuff as "a state of the whole people" and "a party of the entire people" which Khrushchov and company used in usurping the leadership of the Party and the state. It is the most shameful, most thoroughgoing betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat! Under cover of "the dying out of class struggle", the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road wanted to get the proletariat and other working people to lower their guard so that landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and ghosts

and monsters of all kinds could emerge and launch wild attacks on the proletariat, break up the socialist economic base, subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism.

During this period, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road mounted one frenzied attack after another on socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, sometimes out in the open, sometimes behind the scenes. Just before the bourgeois Rightists began their fierce onslaught in 1957, he viciously attacked the socialist system by alleging that "there is no system which is absolutely good" and that "it is no good regarding only our system as good and all others as unsatisfactory".²⁶ He advocated the bourgeois "two-chamber system", saying: "The People's Political Consultative Conference and the National People's Congress are in a sense in the nature of an Upper and a Lower House", adding: "only this is not specified in the Constitution".²⁷ He wanted to turn the People's Political Consultative Conference and the National People's Congress into a bourgeois type of Upper and Lower House, in tune with the idea of a "political planning institute" put forward by the Chang Po-chun — Lo Lung-chi alliance.

At the Lushan Meeting of the Party in 1959, he actively supported the big conspirator, careerist and warlord Peng Teh-huai, who styled himself a "Hai Jui," and had vain hopes of overthrowing the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao.

After Peng Teh-huai's case was brought to light at the meeting, he continued to act in co-ordination with Peng Teh-huai and, while instigating people from behind the scenes, plotted to tamper with the previously prepared summary of the meeting and turn it into a document directed against the "Left deviation" to oppose Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line.

Later he openly attacked the Lushan Meeting and made absurd allegations such as that "the Lushan Meeting made a mistake"; "it should not have fought the Right deviation";²⁸ "it was wrong to combat the Right deviation"; "it left an aftermath throughout the country".²⁹

Especially during the three years of temporary difficulties, he ganged up with all kinds of ghosts and monsters at home and abroad and worked even more frantically for a counter-revolutionary restoration of capitalism. He viciously attacked the Party's general line for building socialism, the great leap forward and the people's communes. He clamoured that the economy was approaching the verge of bankruptcy; that "the situation is no excellent one";³⁰ "the economy is out of balance";³¹ "three parts natural calamities and seven parts man-made disasters"; "acute contradictions have arisen in the worker-peasant alliance". For his own ulterior motives, he demagogically proclaimed

that the peasants "have no ease of mind", the workers "have no ease of mind", and the cadres, too, "cannot possibly have any ease of mind",³² and so on and so forth.

He clamoured: "There should be an opposition; there should be an open opposition both among the people and within the Party."³³ This is how he prepared public opinion for the bourgeoisie to come to power.

He advocated the extension of plots for private use and of free markets, the increase of small enterprises with sole responsibility for their own profits or losses and the fixing of output quotas on the basis of households and actively encouraged "going it alone". He said: "Sufficient retreat should be made in industry and also in agriculture, even to the extent of fixing output quotas on the basis of households and of going it alone!"³⁴; "there is nothing to be frightened of if some bourgeois elements should emerge in society. There is no need to fear the flooding in of capitalism."³⁵

With regard to the international struggle, he beat the drum for capitulation to the imperialists, the modern revisionists and the reactionaries of different countries and favoured stamping out the flames of revolution in the world; he advocated liquidation of struggle in our relations with imperialism, the reactionaries and modern revisionism, and reduction of assistance and support to the revolutionary struggle of other peoples.

He said: "Even as regards the United States, we hope to improve our relationships with it too." He even aspired to "develop friendly relations"³⁶ with the U.S. He asserted that Khrushchov was "unable to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union", that Khrushchov was "truly" opposed to imperialism and that "we should unite with them", "seek common ground while reserving differences" and "together oppose imperialism".³⁷ He went so far as to tell the Communist Party of Burma to lay down its arms, alleging: "You can do without your weapons, you can bury them underground or you can reorganize your troops into the national defence forces"³⁸; and "cooperate" with Ne Win, "to what end?" "To carry out a socialist revolution."³⁹

In August 1962 he again issued his sinister book on "self-cultivation" which betrays the dictatorship of the proletariat and leads people to become more revisionist the more they cultivate themselves according to it. The book became the "theme song" of the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists in their attempts to create public opinion for the restoration of capitalism!

These shocking and revolting facts of the struggle show that after the capitalist economic base was in the main destroyed, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road daily and hourly engaged in criminal activities for the

restoration of capitalism. Particularly during the three years of temporary difficulties, he bared his fangs and hoisted the black anti-Party ensign calling for "an opposition" and to turn the clock back. He launched an all-round attack against the Party and socialism on the political, economic and ideological-cultural fronts, thus presenting an extremely serious threat to the political power of the proletariat.

If things had developed according to his counter-revolutionary revisionist line, drastic class differentiation would have occurred in the countryside; new bourgeois elements would have appeared in great numbers in the cities; the masses of workers and poor and lower-middle peasants would have had a second dose of suffering and sunk back into the miserable life of slaves and beasts of burden; our country's socialist economic base would have been utterly destroyed; a complete change would have taken place in the nature of our proletarian state power and history would have been turned back on to the old road leading to a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society. What a dangerous thing this would have been!

At the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Party in 1962, our great leader Chairman Mao issued the great call, "never forget class struggle", and sounded the clarion for the proletariat to launch an all-round mass counter-attack against the bourgeoisie. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road was now like "a grasshopper in late autumn", approaching his doom with each passing day!

(4)

The history of the dictatorship of the proletariat tells us that political power remains the most fundamental of all questions in the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Summing up the rich historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the world and taking into account the grave fact that the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road was plotting a restoration of capitalism, our great leader Chairman Mao personally aroused the hundreds of millions of the revolutionary people and led them in launching the great, unprecedented proletarian cultural revolution. Thus the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country enters a new, and still deeper and broader stage. It is a great and decisive battle between Chairman Mao's proletarian headquarters and the bourgeois headquarters of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road.

In that great historical document, the May 16, 1966 Circular of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, Chairman Mao pointed out: "Those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have

sneaked into the Party, the government, the army and various cultural circles are a bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize political power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Some of them we have already seen through, others we have not. Some are still trusted by us and are being trained as our successors, persons like Khrushchov, for example, who are still nestling beside us. Party committees at all levels must pay full attention to this matter." By "persons like Khrushchov" nestling beside us, Chairman Mao was referring to none other than the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road and the bourgeois headquarters headed by him.

Why was Chairman Mao's revolutionary line resisted and opposed time and again over the past 17 years? Why did an undercurrent favouring a restoration of capitalism come to the surface again and again? Primarily it is because a bourgeois headquarters had entrenched itself in the apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And this bourgeois headquarters was the greatest menace to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the greatest danger to the socialist state.

The great proletarian cultural revolution has sounded the death-knell for the handful of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road. Struggling in wild desperation as they saw their end approaching, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, in collusion with another top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, formulated and put into operation a bourgeois reactionary line. They countered Chairman Mao's directive by sending out a large number of work-teams to suppress the revolutionary mass movement. In Tsinghua University and at the No. 1 Middle School affiliated to the Peking Teachers' Training University, where the movement was directly under the guidance of China's Khrushchov, the spearhead of struggle was aimed at the revolutionary masses and a number of revolutionaries were labelled "counter-revolutionaries". As for the cadres, his policy was to hit hard at many in order to protect a handful. One issue of the bulletin of the work-team in Peking University, which was circulated with his approval, described a revolutionary incident as a counter-revolutionary incident, and he called on the whole country to follow suit and to impose a white terror, encircling and suppressing revolutionaries and instigating one section of the masses to fight another, and he did all this in a vain attempt to stamp out the raging flames of the great proletarian cultural revolution ignited by Chairman Mao himself.

At this crucial moment our great leader Chairman Mao convened the 11th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee of the Party, published his big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters", a poster of great historical significance,

and personally guided the drawing up of the Decision of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This thoroughly exposed the bourgeois headquarters headed by the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, proclaimed the bankruptcy of the bourgeois reactionary line he had been pushing and announced the victory of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. This is another great contribution by Chairman Mao to the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Led by the great supreme commander Chairman Mao himself, the revolutionary masses throughout the country have carried the great revolutionary mass movement to ever greater heights, and they have finally dragged out this No. 1 agent of the bourgeoisie within the Party and his gang of scoundrels. In the upsurge of revolutionary mass criticism and repudiation which has been launched throughout the country, he and his gang are now caught in a net from which there is no escape, cast by the hundreds of millions of revolutionary army-men and people. They resemble the proverbial "rats scurrying across the street with everyone yelling: Beat them! Beat them!" What is this "monstrous creature", this top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, actually like? His own criminal history of sham revolution and actual counter-revolution in the past forty years and more provides the irrefutable answer. The evidence of these crimes is conclusive. The iron-clad proofs pile up mountain high. Can he then absolve himself by deception, by denials or by resistance? **"Whither now the God of Plague may I ask? The flames of his funeral pyre light up the skies!"**

The great proletarian cultural revolution is a major event for our great people. In the brilliant light of Mao Tse-tung's thought the sea of red flags surges forward, the masses in their hundreds of millions are struggling and studying, and are criticizing and repudiating the bourgeoisie. Mao Tse-tung's thought has become their food, their weapon and their compass. They vow to be good fighters of Chairman Mao. They vow to ensure that the proletarian state will never change its colour! Mao Tse-tung's thought has united the hundreds of millions into an all-conquering, invincible material force that is shaking the old world and creating the new.

"Only socialism can save China!"

All through the past decades, our great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander and great helmsman Chairman Mao has commanded the mighty army of the revolution, and has directed it to pursue the tottering foe, to bind the Grey Dragon, and to make great plans and attack all that is corrupt and evil. He has steered the ship of the Chinese revolu-

tion forward through the torrents, by-passing the hidden reefs, braving the winds and waves and advancing in triumph. He has brought Marxism-Leninism to a completely new stage — the stage of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

It is Chairman Mao who has taught us that the new democratic revolution is the necessary preparation for the socialist revolution and the socialist revolution is the inevitable sequel to the new democratic revolution. Following the victory of the new democratic revolution, it was necessary, without interruption, for the revolution to move on to the stage of socialism.

It is Chairman Mao who has taught us that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun and that only with guns can the old world under the rule of imperialism and all reaction be transformed.

It is Chairman Mao who has taught us that after seizing political power, the proletariat must persist in and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and keep to the socialist road. No matter how many things we may have to do, we must never forget the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is Chairman Mao who personally initiated the great and unprecedented proletarian cultural revolution, and who has taught us that classes and class struggle continue to exist throughout the historical period of socialist society, and that under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolution must be carried through to the end.

"The East is red; the sun rises; in China has appeared a Mao Tse-tung."

The orientation given by Chairman Mao is the orientation for the revolutionary people of the whole world. The road which he has opened up is the road along which the revolutionary people of the whole world will advance.

Whither China? Whither the world? The wheel of history is moving in the direction pointed out by Mao Tse-tung's thought!

NOTES:

¹"Criticism of the Past Work and Plan for the Future Work of the Club", August 20, 1923.

²Hankow *Minkuo Daily*, July 5, 1927.

³"Strategy and Tactics of the Chinese Revolution", October 10, 1942.

⁴*ibid.*

⁵"A Report on the Situation", February 1, 1946.

⁶*ibid.*

⁷*ibid.*

⁸"Speech at the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference", November 4, 1951.

⁹Quoted indirectly from "Patriotism or National Betrayal?" (See supplement to the May 1967 issue of *China Reconstructs*.)

¹⁰Speech at the First National Congress of Youth", May 12, 1949.

¹¹"Speech at the First Session of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference", September 21, 1949.

¹²"Speech at the First National Congress of Youth", May 12, 1949.

¹³"Speech at a Discussion Among Industrialists and Businessmen", April 25, 1949.

¹⁴*ibid.*

¹⁵"Speech at the First National Congress of Youth", May 12, 1949.

¹⁶"Directive for the Work in Tientsin", April 24, 1949.

¹⁷"Speech at a Discussion Among Industrialists and Businessmen", April 25, 1949.

¹⁸*ibid.*

¹⁹*ibid.*

²⁰"Directive for the Work in Tientsin", April 24, 1949.

²¹"Instructions to An Tzu-wen and Others", January 23, 1950.

²²"Remarks on 'Raising Mutual-Aid Organizations a Step Higher in the Old Liberated Areas' by Shansi Provincial Party Committee", July 3, 1951.

²³"Instructions to An Tzu-wen and Others", January 23, 1950.

²⁴Talk with a foreign guest on July 13, 1956.

²⁵"Speech at the Shanghai Party Cadres' Conference", April 27, 1957.

²⁶Talk with foreigners on June 17, 1956.

²⁷Speech at the Standing Committee Meeting of the National People's Congress on November 18, 1956.

²⁸"Speech at Cadres' Forum of the Tsinan Military Area Command", July 9, 1964.

²⁹"Speech at the Forum of Secretaries of the Regional Party Committees of Hopet Province", July 2, 1964.

³⁰"Speech at the 18th Supreme State Conference", March 21, 1962.

³¹"Instructions to the Shihchiachuang and Wush Investigation Groups of the General Office of the Party Central Committee", April 24, 1962.

³²"Speech at the Working Conference of the Party Central Committee", May 31, 1961.

³³"Speech at the Working Conference of the Party Central Committee", February 8, 1962.

³⁴Speech in June 1962.

³⁵Speech on October 22, 1961.

³⁶Talk with a foreign guest on March 6, 1963.

³⁷Talk with foreign comrades on June 27, 1962.

³⁸Talk with a foreigner on April 26, 1963.

³⁹Talk with foreign comrades on July 20, 1963.

COMMENTS ON TAO CHU'S TWO BOOKS

by YAO WEN-YUAN

LIKE a succession of gales, the great proletarian cultural revolution is shaking the whole of China and indeed the whole world.

The situation is excellent. After a year of stirring battles, the great proletarian cultural revolution which started with mass criticism and repudiation in the field of culture is now triumphantly entering the phase of a mass movement of criticism and repudiation of the handful of top Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road. This campaign of mass criticism is of great political significance. It is a deep-going development of the proletarian revolutionaries' struggle to seize power, an important step in the elimination of revisionist poison, an ideological motive force mobilizing the masses in their tens of millions for active struggle, criticism and transformation, a mammoth mass struggle for the thorough application of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line in the fields of politics, economy, culture and military affairs.

The two books before us, *Ideals, Sentiments and Spiritual Life* (*Ideals* for short) published in 1962 and *Thinking, Feeling and Literary Talent* (*Thinking* for short) published in 1964, are both excellent negative material for study in the mass criticism campaign. They are sister books of the sinister work on "self-cultivation" and vividly portray the reactionary and ugly soul of Tao Chu the revisionist.

Prior to the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, Tao Chu was a faithful executant of the bourgeois reactionary line represented by China's Khrushchev. After that session, when the reactionary features of the two top persons in authority taking the capitalist road were exposed before the whole Party, he became the chief person representing and continuing to carry out the bourgeois reactionary line. In league with such henchmen as the counter-revolutionary revisionist Wang Jen-chung, he continued to frantically oppose and distort the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao and to oppose and boycott the great thought of Mao Tse-tung, recruited deserters and turncoats, colluded with Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road and everywhere issued instructions to suppress the revolutionary masses and support and shield counter-revolutionary revisionists and monsters, vainly trying by base tricks to blanket or annul the criticism and repudiation of the top capitalist roaders in the Party at the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

In the forward march of history, all who overestimate the strength of reaction and underestimate that of the people — adlepaters dressed up as heroes and resisting progress — invariably end up quickly as contemptible clowns. At a 10,000-strong rally on

July 30, 1966, this man who styled himself "a proletarian revolutionary in the main" waved his fist and haughtily shouted: "You can have me overthrown, too, if you don't believe me." How arrogant he was then! A virtual man-eater! He was trying to intimidate the masses, implying: Woe to anyone who dares oppose a "veteran revolutionary" like me; I am a hero and will never, never fall. But the logic of history is such that anyone who comes out in opposition to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, the great proletarian cultural revolution and the revolutionary masses inevitably falls. The more rounded out a reactionary's performance, the heavier his fall. In retrospect, it is clear that the ludicrous performance he put on, glorifying himself and intimidating the people, was just another silly layer of grease paint on this double-dealer's face.

"I have always been a revolutionary." Well, let's use these two books as our chief material and see whom this eternally revolutionary person "always" followed, what kind of "revolution" he was engaged in, what "ideals" he really cherished, what "sentiments" he advocated, the "thinking and feeling" of which class he publicized and what kind of "spiritual life" he led.

Bourgeois Counter-Revolutionary "Ideals"

Which "side" does Tao Chu belong to? The ideals of which side does he advocate in his books? The evidence he himself has provided gives sufficient answer.

In August 1955, when the socialist transformation of agriculture and handicraft industries began surging ahead and the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were locked in a life-and-death struggle, Tao Chu stepped forward and self-assuredly proclaimed: "All of us belong to the same side, the side of the Chinese people. With the exception of the counter-revolutionaries, all should closely unite." This "all of us . . . with the exception of the counter-revolutionaries" is subject to the rule of one dividing into two — the proletariat on the one side and the bourgeoisie on the other. Tao Chu viciously slandered the ideological remoulding of intellectuals as "an insult to one's personality". He talked rubbish when he said that Hu Shih's reactionary ideas were simply "a question of method of thinking" which "can only be judged clearly . . . after 30 or 40 years." It is obvious that his "all of us" actually referred to the bourgeoisie and its agents such as Hu Shih. His boastful advocating about "the side of the Chinese people" who should "closely" embrace each other in reality referred to the bourgeois reactionaries opposed to the people.

In the same report, Tao Chu also with boundless sympathy described "the counter-revolutionaries

now lying low on the mainland" as being "in a pitiful plight and a painful frame of mind." Words reflect one's thinking. With the words "pitiful" and "painful," Tao Chu at one stroke wrote off the hatefulness and brutality of the counter-revolutionaries and vividly portrayed a "spiritual life" in which he was in perfect harmony with them.

Two years later, in May 1957, when the Rightists were launching wild attacks, Tao Chu promptly wrote articles for the press, declaring that "by and large classes have now disappeared," "the contradictions within the country between the enemy and ourselves have been resolved," and "the function of dictatorship should be weakened" in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which should be "geared . . . to guiding production . . . and to organizing the people's economic life." The landlords, rich peasants and bourgeoisie all became members of one "big family," the dictatorship of the proletariat could be abolished and "a state of the whole people" with the sole task of "guiding production" could soon come into being. The out-and-out revisionist note he struck, which was directed at overthrowing the dictatorship of the proletariat, conclusively shows him up as a ringleader of the bourgeois Rightists.

Two years later, in the first half of 1959, when the socialist revolution was developing in greater depth, Tao Chu in his article, "The Character of the Pine," advised "never yielding to adverse circumstances," and in another article, "Revolutionary Firmness," he talked of "facing the raging sea" and the ability to withstand the "onslaughts of storms and hurricanes." Under his pen, the stirring great leap forward, the heroic aspiration of the revolutionary people to transform the world, became "adverse circumstances." As the tempest of socialist revolution struck at the bourgeoisie, landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists, and at their agents the Peng Teh-huai anti-Party clique, Tao Chu hysterically called for the ability "to withstand the onslaughts of storms and hurricanes." There is no need to add a single word; his counter-revolutionary stand is crystal clear.

Six years went by. It was 1965. On many occasions following the glorious Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, Chairman Mao pointed out that the principal contradiction within China was the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between the socialist and the capitalist roads. In the document concerning the socialist education movement, known as "the 23 points," he stated that "the main target of the present movement is those within the Party who are in authority and are taking the capitalist road." These important instructions of Chairman Mao's were rabidly opposed and resisted by China's Khrushchov and by Tao Chu and company. Tao Chu said: "I think that at the present stage the task of reflecting the contradictions among

the people should be put in the most important position." To say that "contradictions among the people" formed the principal contradiction "at the present stage" was a flagrant denial of the fact that the principal contradiction within the country was the struggle between the two classes and between the two roads. It meant that he regarded the questions concerning the handful of counter-revolutionaries, renegades, Rightists and those in authority taking the capitalist road as contradictions "among the people," and thus covered up their crimes in trying to usurp the leadership in the Party, government and army, his purpose being to shield all the fiendish bourgeois counter-revolutionaries who had sneaked into the Party.

Has Tao Chu "always been a revolutionary?" No, he has always been a counter-revolutionary! It can be said that at every turning point in history, he invariably and openly took the bourgeois stand and opposed Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and socialism. His much vaunted "ideals" are bourgeois counter-revolutionary ideals, the reactionary ideals of protecting and developing capitalism, the idle dream of overthrowing the dictatorship of the proletariat and restoring capitalism in China.

For example:

(1) Tao Chu says: "The idea of socialism is to use every means to ensure rapid national industrialization." If this out-and-out reactionary theory of "socialism" were valid, wouldn't it follow that the industrialized United States attained "socialism" long ago? For the achievement of industrialization, there are two roads, two lines and two kinds of means — the socialist and the capitalist. To take the socialist road, it is essential to rely on the working class and the revolutionary masses, on the keeping of politics in the fore and on the revolutionary consciousness and initiative of the hundreds of millions of people awakened by Mao Tse-tung's thought, so that the leadership of enterprises is really in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries. On the other hand, taking the capitalist road means reliance on a few bourgeois "experts," on material incentives and on the conservatives, as is repeatedly advocated in Tao Chu's book, it means the usurpation of the leadership of the enterprises by a privileged stratum representing the interests of the bourgeoisie. What Tao Chu calls "every means" is reliance on the bourgeoisie in order to develop the capitalist system of exploitation and oppose the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce.

"The history of China in the last century or so is a history of receiving blows, and the reason is that it had no industry." Here Tao Chu talks like a bungling teacher of history giving us a lecture on the modern history of China, a lecture which is naturally a reversal of history. The main reason why the Chinese received blows in the 109 years from 1840 to 1949 is not that they had no industry,

but that political power was in the hands of the lackeys of imperialism, in the hands of traitors, from the Ching government through the northern warlords down to Chiang Kai-shek. Ever since the seizure of power throughout China by the proletariat and the working people under the leadership of their great leader Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the imperialists have had to stop and think how strong their snouts are before they try to attack us. The more thoroughgoing the great cultural revolution, the deeper the thought of Mao Tse-tung penetrates the consciousness of the people and the stronger the dictatorship of the proletariat, the more certain it is that no one will be able to match us in a war. This is the proletarian revolutionary ideal. To attribute the receiving of blows in the past entirely to the lack of industry is to cover up all the heinous crimes of the vicious traitors and to prettify the Chinese lackeys of the international bourgeoisie who have tried to restore capitalism in the name of "developing industry." This chimes perfectly with the theory of national betrayal of China's Khrushchov!

(2) Tao Chu says that "the ideal of communism" means "comfortable houses." It is to "provide every room with electricity at night and enable everybody to dress sprucely and ride in motorcars. . . ." In short, it means "good food, good clothing and good housing." It means pleasure-seeking. He is ready to sell his very soul, with a cheap "communist" label thrown in, to whoever gives him "good food and good housing." This is indeed the philosophy of the lowest traitors! Communism in appearance but ultra-individualism or capitalism in essence — that is the definition of Tao Chu's "ideal of communism." Wouldn't it follow from this definition that the life of the U.S. bourgeoisie perfectly fits the "ideal of communism?"

(3) Tao Chu says that it is a "lofty ideal" always to keep in mind that "one will become a navigator, aviator, scientist, writer, engineer, teacher . . ." He lists one expert profession after another, but makes no mention at all of any worker, peasant or soldier. In the eyes of this renegade from the proletariat, the revolutionary workers, peasants and soldiers should rank very low. More than that, they should simply be condemned to eternal and bottomless perdition, without any hope of escape. At the other extreme is a long string of bourgeois "experts," who are assigned a very high, or even the "loftiest" place. "The bourgeoisie has taken part in the democratic movement. They have industrial know-how and are not as corrupt as the landlords." Yes, here you admit that by "experts" you refer not to proletarian specialists but to the bourgeoisie and their representatives in cultural circles. What you call "know-how" is the capitalists' knowledge of how to exploit the workers craftily and ruthlessly, and other similar knowledge. It is Tao Chu's "lofty ideal" to stage a counter-revolutionary come-back through those representatives of

the bourgeoisie who have climbed very high. Today, a number of very high bourgeois "authorities" have been pulled down by young revolutionary fighters.

Another of these great ideals is, in Tao Chu's words, "really enabling everybody to have personal ease of mind." In 1962, just at the time when the bourgeoisie launched wanton attacks on the proletariat and when evil spirits of all kinds danced in riotous revelry and poisonous weeds abounded, Tao Chu, in order to give the bourgeoisie "ease of mind," included in his article "Thoughts on How to Make Creative Writing Flourish" such nonsense about the bourgeois intellectuals as that "quite a number have become intellectuals of the working people," and "it is necessary to bring the enthusiasm of labouring intellectuals into play." Fine! The "three family village", such people as Tien Han, Hsia Yen, Wu Han and Chien Po-tsan as well as Hai Jui, Wei Cheng, Li Hui-niang and the like, had all "become intellectuals of the working people." Wouldn't they now be able to prepare public opinion for a capitalist restoration with still greater vigour, after their label was removed and they had been provided with a fresh halo? Wouldn't they now be able to work to restore capitalism in comfort, with everybody happily "in harmony and enjoying ease of mind"?

Either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie is bound to lack "ease of mind" — this is the inevitable consequence of class struggle. When the proletariat has "ease of mind," the bourgeoisie is bound to feel miserable. When the bourgeoisie has "ease of mind," the proletariat is bound to suffer. Either one or the other. Whoever calls for redressing the bourgeoisie's grievance that it does not have "ease of mind" only proves that he himself shares the very feelings of the bourgeoisie.

Tao Chu says that this "socialist ideal" of his is "beneficial to everybody," including the bourgeoisie. Socialism means the eradication of the bourgeoisie through the dictatorship of the proletariat. How can it be beneficial to the bourgeoisie? The "socialism" which is "beneficial to everybody" is phoney socialism, or Khrushchov-type revisionism, it is the counter-revolutionary theory of Bukharin that capitalism can "grow" into socialism. It is the reactionary theory of the "party of the entire people," "the state of the whole people" and the "socialism of the whole people" which abandons class struggle and abolishes the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the slogan for restoring capitalism in China after the triumph of socialism.

Enough! The material cited is sufficient to let us see this agent of the bourgeoisie in his true colours. He has persisted along the capitalist road which opposes socialism. What he thinks, praises and loves is capitalism; what he fears, curses and hates is socialism. In a word, the "ideals" in his writings are remoulding the state, society and the Party in the ugly image of the bourgeoisie.

This person has a "famous saying": "To establish socialist ideas" or ideals it is "at least necessary to make socialist ideas cover over fifty per cent of the whole realm of one's ideology." How is it possible to measure man's world outlook in percentages? It is utterly ridiculous. Stripped of its pretences, it is just a clumsy and colossal swindle. Its purpose is to tell the bourgeoisie to appear in disguise, to cloak "fifty per cent" of their language with "socialist ideas" and thus try to cover up their evil capitalist nature. This is the most typical of revisionism. Both books were written in this way. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road said in heart-to-heart talks with the bourgeoisie: So long as the bourgeoisie master Marxist phrases, they can "grow happily and peacefully into socialism" and gain both fame and wealth. This is the best footnote to "over fifty per cent" of "socialist ideas."

The "Spiritual Life" of a Renegade and Flunkey

Would you like to know what kind of "spiritual life" is extolled in these two books? It is the reactionary Kuomintang philosophy plus the flunkey mentality.

Tao Chu has engraved on his memory and learnt by rote the reactionary and decadent idealism of the Kuomintang and the gangster talk of hangman Chiang Kai-shek. This counter-revolutionary stuff occupies pride of place in his "spiritual life." Only a renegade can emit such reactionary rubbish.

The following is to be found among Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary utterances: "As to the meaning of politics, Dr. Sun Yat-sen has told us clearly: politics is the management of public affairs . . . therefore the meaning of politics is finding the scientific method for the general mobilization of the whole nation to manage public affairs in order to seek the greatest welfare for the whole nation and people."

Tao Chu takes all this over without any change. He writes: "First of all, it is necessary to understand what politics is. Probably you all know Dr. Sun Yat-sen. He said: 'Politics is the management of public affairs.' Our 'management of public affairs' has the purpose of making our country prosperous and strong, making the people happy . . . that is, working for the people's interests, explaining reasons clearly and making people understand these reasons so that they join gladly and willingly in the work of building a socialist society."

Tao Chu shamelessly proclaimed that he was a student of Chiang Kai-shek. Or, more accurately, a flunkey — for doesn't he sound like a flunkey?

Calling politics "the management of public affairs" is the reactionary standpoint of the bourgeois exploiters. There is no such thing as "the

public" in the abstract. In a class society the public is divided into classes. Nor is there such a thing as "management" in the abstract. In a class society management is invariably the handling of relations between classes, a question of which class controls and exercises political power. Chairman Mao penetratingly points out in his *Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art*: "Politics, whether revolutionary or counter-revolutionary, is the struggle of class against class." Analysed from this standpoint of Chairman Mao's, politics is the struggle to consolidate or overthrow the political power of this or that class, the struggle to safeguard or destroy this or that system of ownership, the struggle to seize or preserve the interests of this or that class (or group). The proletariat can finally emancipate itself only by emancipating all mankind. Therefore, in its political struggle to overthrow oppression by the bourgeoisie and establish and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletariat stands not only for its own class interests but also for those of the broad masses of the labouring people. It is in order to cover up the class content of its political activities and its oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and the working people that the bourgeoisie describes its counter-revolutionary politics in such abstract terms as "the management of public affairs." This same old trick has been played throughout, starting with the bourgeoisie in the 18th century and coming right down to the Soviet modern revisionists with their "state of the whole people." Chiang Kai-shek's "management of the public" consists of the sanguinary suppression and slaughter of the toiling masses by the counter-revolutionary state apparatus, while describing the counter-revolutionary rule of the landlords and the bourgeoisie as "seeking happiness for the whole nation and people" and even deceiving them by "general mobilization." This is the zenith of shamelessness. By rehashing all this, flunkey Tao Chu tries to bring about counter-revolutionary capitalist restoration and abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, while describing servile acts in the interests of the bourgeoisie and all other reactionaries as "working for the interests of the people"; he also tries to cheat the people by "explaining the reasons clearly." This, too, is the zenith of shamelessness.

In his counter-revolutionary utterances, Chiang Kai-shek was an advocate of the "spirit of sincere devotion" and lauded "the man with a foreknowledge and keen perception of things." Tao Chu dishes all this up unchanged:

"We do not in toto negate Dr. Sun Yat-sen's expressions 'the man with a foreknowledge and keen perception of things' and 'the man with a backward knowledge and blunt perception of things'. These are to be found in society: some people make progress faster and some more slowly. If only a man has the desire to advance, in the end he will make progress. . . ."

"Marxists should be magnanimous to other people and strict with themselves. . . . They should not demand too much of non-Party people, but should seek 'sincere unity' with them as Sun Yat-sen said. . . ."

The phrases "the man with a foreknowledge and keen perception of things" and "the man with a backward knowledge and blunt perception of things" express the reactionary viewpoint of historical idealism which empties things of their class content and is divorced from social practice. Chairman Mao points out: "It is man's social being that determines his thinking. Once the correct ideas characteristic of the advanced class are grasped by the masses, these ideas turn into a material force which changes society and changes the world." Those counter-revolutionary revisionists who will never repent and those diehard capitalist roaders who refuse to correct their errors after repeated education are that way not because they are "men with a backward knowledge and blunt perception of things," but because of their social being, i.e., their bourgeois class status, which determines their obstinately taking the capitalist road. Similarly, the U.S. imperialist butchers and the renegade clique of the C.P.S.U. are that way not because they lack "the desire to advance," but because they represent the reactionary bourgeoisie, and whatever tricks they play in the line they adopt, it can only be a counter-revolutionary line serving the U.S. monopoly capitalists and the Soviet bourgeois privileged stratum. As for the proletarian revolutionaries, the reason why they can smash all obstacles, break through every kind of onerous and cruel suppression by the handful of top Party capitalist roaders and win victory is not that they are "men with a foreknowledge and keen perception of things," but that they have grasped the thought of Mao Tse-tung, this theoretical weapon which is the quintessence of the highest wisdom of the proletariat of China and the world, and that they represent the interests of the proletariat and the working masses. Therefore, the more they fight, the stronger they become, and they are indomitable in all difficulties and always maintain dynamic revolutionary optimism. Today, in advocating reactionary idealism such as that we have described, Tao Chu tries to make people believe that the bourgeoisie "will make progress in the end," to lull the people's revolutionary vigilance and to help the bourgeoisie sneak into the ranks of the proletariat to carry out sabotage.

The expression "sincere unity" as used by Tao Chu is through and through the language of the Kuomintang reactionaries! Different classes give different interpretations of the identical term. We, too, occasionally use this term. Then it means unity for the definite aim of revolution, for the struggle to carry out the revolutionary tasks of the proletariat. We always say, unity subject to a socialist orientation, and unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought. In contrast,

Tao Chu's "sincere unity" discards all principle, betrays the socialist orientation and caters to the needs of the bourgeoisie. Unity and struggle are two contradictory aspects of a single entity. Without struggle, there is no unity. Unity is relative and transitional whereas struggle is absolute. Everything in this world divides into two in the course of its development. Men's knowledge always develops in struggle. As Chairman Mao points out: "Marxism can develop only through struggle, and not only is this true of the past and the present, it is necessarily true of the future as well." Where is there such an immutable "sincere unity" as Tao Chu's? Chiang Kai-shek used the term "sincere unity" to cover up internal dog-fights and as a tool for instilling fascist ideas, whereas Tao Chu does something original—he puts up the signboard of Marxism to disintegrate the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

The book also says: "The reason why victory could be won in the earlier period of the great revolution of 1925-27 was that Dr. Sun Yat-sen reorganized the Kuomintang and adopted the three great policies 'in conformity with' the objective law of the revolution at that time." It is a plain distortion of history and a reversal of the truth to attribute victory in the early period of the First Revolutionary Civil War of 1925-27 not to the correct leadership and policies of the Communist Party of China represented by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, not to the struggles of the revolutionary people, but solely to the Kuomintang. Tao Chu simply speaks from the stand of the Kuomintang reactionaries. Isn't he speaking with a traitor's voice when he gives the fruits of victory won with the blood of countless revolutionary martyrs to the Kuomintang in order to please it?

Enough! Enough! Does not all this vile talk reveal that behind Tao Chu's "spiritual life" lies the realm of reactionary Kuomintang philosophy?

Besides the reactionary Kuomintang philosophy, his ideas are all rubbish from the sinister book on "self-cultivation."

Doesn't the book *Ideals* cheat our young people when it prates that "personal and collective interests cannot be separated," that if a person makes a show of "doing a good job," he will be "taken into account," "be appreciated," "be praised" and even "have his name spread to the whole country and the whole world"? This is a complete reproduction of the philistine speculator's philosophy of the Khrushchov of China, the philosophy of "lose a little to gain much." In February 1960, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road offered the representatives of the bourgeoisie an idea. He said: "Personal benefits will accrue if you serve the people wholeheartedly." These words are an accurate summary of this bourgeois careerist's experience in "getting on in the world" over several decades

of his life and generalize the quintessence of the philosophy of life of this traitor to the proletariat. When used by him and the handful of people like him, such terms as "serve the people" and "collective interests" are falsehood and deception, they are employed for show, they are the means, whereas personal interests, personal power and personal enjoyment are real, they are the ends they pursue, representing the essence of their dirty souls. This is the trick used by the bourgeois counter-revolutionary double-dealers to sneak into the ranks of the revolutionaries and to seize power.

Doesn't the book *Ideals* cheat the young people when it says: "Our common world outlook together with our common method of thinking . . . consists in proceeding from objective reality, in admitting that right is right and wrong is wrong"? This, too, is merchandise bought from China's Khrushchov. In class society, there are distinct class criteria for right and wrong. Reality means, first of all, the reality of class struggle: do you stand on the side of the proletariat or on the side of the bourgeoisie? On the side of imperialism or on the side of the revolutionary people? On the side of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, or on the side of revisionism? On the side of the proletarian headquarters headed by Chairman Mao or on the side of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois headquarters? Using the abstractions of "right and wrong" to cover up their class approach to problems is the common characteristic of opportunists who have sold their souls. In May 1949, China's Khrushchov said shamelessly: "The capitalists said that our newspapers were not well run. I said that indeed they were not altogether well run. I admitted this mistake too. . . . In the future we should adopt the attitude: right is right, wrong is wrong, good is good, bad is bad. . . . If there is anything good about the capitalists, we should say it's good; if there is anything bad about the workers, we should say it's bad." Look how he "proceeded from reality"! "Where there is anything good about the capitalists, we should say it's good; if there is anything bad about the workers, we should say it's bad." What a fair judge he is! What a clearly defined approach to "right and wrong" this scab takes! See how this infamous flunkey of the bourgeoisie never forgets his masters' "goodness"! How obvious is his ferocity when he condemns the workers for being "bad"! And how well the author of the book *Ideals* has memorized the soul-selling philosophy of China's Khrushchov!

The book *Ideals* misrepresents dialectical materialism when it states that "existence is primary while thinking is only secondary, the objective is primary while the subjective is only secondary," totally denying man's dynamic role, the leap from matter to consciousness and from consciousness to matter, and the dialectical process of practice, knowledge, again practice, again knowledge . . . in the

development of man's knowledge. This is certainly not dialectical materialism but reactionary metaphysics. The proletariat's sole aim in understanding the objective world is to transform it in accordance with the laws inherent in the development of things. If one negates the transformation of the objective world, negates the revolution and the struggle to push history forward, doesn't the statement that "the objective is primary" become empty words on a sheet of paper? But this criticism alone is far from sufficient. It must be understood that the reason why he advocates this mechanical or vulgar materialism is to spread opportunism of a certain kind, under which one drifts with the current and is ready to sell out the interests of the proletariat at any time in order to serve the bourgeoisie. Isn't that true? The bourgeoisie can be said to have an objective existence. One may proceed from the stand of the bourgeoisie, follow its words and take its interests as the criterion, "right is right and wrong is wrong." In this way the restoration of capitalism can be brought about under the cloak of "seeking the truth from facts" and dialectical materialism. These tricks can be seen through once their true nature is exposed.

Feelings of Bitter Hatred Towards the Proletariat

In May 1959, just before the revisionist Peng Teh-huai dished up his sinister programme in a desperate effort to restore capitalism, Tao Chu, in his article "The Sun's Radiance," blatantly and viciously abused our great socialist cause, our great Party and our great leader. On the one hand, he said that people used the words "the east is red, the sun rises" to "describe the vigour and vitality of our great cause" and that they "eulogize our Party and leader by likening them to the sun." On the other hand, he attacked the "faults" of the sun openly and railed obliquely: "In the depth of summer when the glaring sun is scorching the earth and making people sweat, they grumble and say that the sun's light and heat are excessive. And as everyone knows, and has pointed out too, the sun itself has black spots on it."

"The sun itself has black spots on it." Is this not downright invective against our Party and great leader? In Tao Chu's eyes not only are there "black spots," but socialism is altogether pitch black. For those who see with bourgeois eyes, brightness and darkness are reversed. They are blinder than the blind. In the view of this revisionist, the radiance of socialism shed by the sun is intolerable to those in authority taking the capitalist road, it reveals their true features, makes them "sweat" and is "excessive." This is where the "faults" of the sun lie. In fact, this is precisely why the sun is great. Monsters and demons, bedbugs and lice, germs and viruses

which hide in dark corners can only be killed when they are exposed to the light and heat of the sun. True working people are tempered and get stronger in the sunshine. How can one get strong without sweating in the sun? To condemn the sun for its "light and heat" is in fact to condemn the proletariat for "exceeding the limit," to condemn socialism and the people's communes for their "excesses." This naked bourgeois double-talk only shows him up as a ghost that dares not face the light of the sun.

In "The Character of the Pine," does not Tao Chu praise the pine for "shutting out the burning sun's glare by its foliage in summer?" The brilliance of Mao Tse-tung's thought cannot be shut out. He who is bent on challenging brightness can only sink from darkness into deeper darkness.

It is noteworthy that the phrase "eulogize our Party and leader by likening them to the sun" was suddenly changed into "eulogize our great, glorious and correct Party by likening it to the sun" in the second edition of *Ideals* which came out in 1965. This dodge which was meant to cover up his vicious purpose actually exposes it more flagrantly and perfectly reveals his guilty conscience. He cut out the word "leader." Does not this precisely indicate that, between 1959 and 1962, when he wrote this article and published this book, he directed his spearhead at our great leader? Otherwise, why should he hastily cut it out? He added the words "great, glorious and correct" before "Party." Does not this precisely indicate that he did not consider the Chinese Communist Party great, glorious and correct when he wrote his article and published his book? Otherwise, why should he hastily add them? He had a guilty conscience, and feared his looks would betray him. That is why he was in such a pother. Nevertheless, the rephrasing mentioned above inadvertently revealed his crimes in opposing the Party, socialism and Chairman Mao in coordination with Peng Teh-huai and company—an ironclad fact which he can never succeed in denying.

By late September 1959, the Lushan Meeting of the Party Central Committee had ended, the Peng Teh-huai anti-Party clique had been exposed and the rabid attack launched by the revisionists had been smashed. Then in his article "A Hard-Won Victory," this revisionist Tao Chu was compelled to go through the motions of expressing dissatisfaction with "a few persons" who "took a keen interest in the shortcomings in our work." However, who were the few persons he referred to? Did they not include Tao Chu himself? Was it not he that ordered the press, in one of his articles, to "publish the shortcomings and errors in our work and to do this, notwithstanding the fact that they were but a single finger as compared with nine?" Wasn't he the person who was keen on exposing what he called the "dark side" and "black spots" of socialism? This cannot

be denied. It is precisely because he had a hand in the dirty business that he expressed boundless sympathy in this article for those whom he referred to as a few persons. He said that "in mentioning these people we hope that they will change their stand and, first of all, join the ranks of the builders of socialism body and soul. This amounted to advising the bankrupt Right opportunists to pretend to "change their stand" so as to sneak their way into the revolutionary ranks and to continue their anti-socialist activities.

Burning hatred for the proletariat, deep affection and solicitude for the bourgeoisie—such are Tao Chu's feelings. Here this malignant monster stands revealed, now stripped of his mask.

"Literary Talent" Which Is Rotten to the Core

How shameful it is for a man to preen himself on his "literary talent" on the strength of a pretentious literary style and unintelligible language!

Though displaying no literary talent whatsoever, the book actively propagates the revisionist line in literature and art in its entirety. The author, Tao Chu, has faithfully applied the reactionary programme for literature and art laid down by the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road and is a jackal from the same lair as Lu Ting-yi and Chou Yang. In the spring of 1960, at the "National Conference of Newsreel and Documentary Scenarists" which was convened by the counter-revolutionary revisionists Hsia Yen and Chen Huang-mei of the old Ministry of Culture, they distributed the big poisonous weed *Thinking, Feeling and Literary Talent* as a conference document for all participants to study. This shows to what extent they worked in collusion. To counter Chairman Mao's line on literature and art, Tao Chu had netted into his black ragbag almost every kind of reactionary idea then prevalent in literary and art circles, i.e., the theory of "human nature," of "truthful writing," of freedom of creation," of "the middle character," the theory that "there is no harm in ghost plays," etc. Let us give one or two examples and briefly refute them.

"Communist Party members are warm-hearted . . . they must feel for everybody except counter-revolutionaries." In class society there are only class feelings; there are no feelings above class. "Feelings" here means "love." "To feel for everybody" is identical with the "love for everybody" propagated by modern revisionism. It means to love the exploiting classes, love renegades, love their flunkies and love those in authority taking the capitalist road. This is the most shameless genuflection and homage to reactionaries.

"We must fully develop the writers' freedom of creation. The writer's pen is his own and the writer's ideas are his own. We must allow the writers independence of creation." This is a naked counter-revolutionary slogan straight out of the Petofi Club. There is only freedom in the concrete, no freedom in the abstract. In class society there is only class freedom; there is no freedom above class. All works of literature and art serve the politics of definite classes. There is no such thing as "free" literature and art detached from class politics nor can there be any. Whatever their particular form of expression, the ideas of any person, including those of any writer, are not isolated "ideas of his own." They are a manifestation of the ideas, interests and aspirations of definite classes and the reflection of class relations in a given society. Do the 700 million Chinese people have 700 million kinds of "ideas of their own"? Certainly not. Fundamentally they fall into only two kinds—one is the world outlook of the proletariat, or Mao Tse-tung's thought; the other is the world outlook of the bourgeoisie, or bourgeois individualism of every kind. To advocate "freedom of creation" or "independence of creation" which depart from Mao Tse-tung's thought is to instigate demons and freaks "freely" to attack socialism and propagate capitalism, and to deprive the proletarian revolutionaries of all freedom of counter-attack, thus serving the criminal intrigue of restoring capitalism. The term "freedom of creation" is nothing but a fig-leaf for the diehard servants of the bourgeoisie.

"Life is many-sided. It does not conform to one pattern. So don't confine it within a fixed framework." This is nothing but the "theory of opposition to subject matter as the decisive factor." Using the pretext of opposing "a fixed framework," its purpose is actually to oppose revolutionary writers doing their best to reflect the class struggle in the socialist era, sing the praise of the workers, peasants and soldiers and portray proletarian heroes. "Life is many-sided." Actually, it has two main sides. One is the revolutionary struggle of the proletarian revolutionaries and the broad working masses who, guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, push history forward. The other is the rotten reactionary life of the bourgeois reactionaries, who resist the progress of history. We must take the militant life of the proletarian revolutionaries who are really conscious of their historical task as the principal aspect, as our orientation and as the central theme for praise and portrayal, and through the portrayal of typical heroes, reflect our unprecedentedly heroic age and the tremendous power and triumph of Mao Tse-tung's thought. As for the reactionary rotten life of the bourgeoisie, it can serve only as the target for criticism, assault and exposure and must never serve as the main side of creative works.

So long as literature and art "truthfully reflect reality, . . . to me, their role at times is no less important than that of editorials and reports." All images created in works of literature and art show the political tendencies of the writers and artists, their class love and class hatred. There is no such thing as an abstract or disinterested "truthful reflection of reality." Proletarian revolutionaries are thoroughgoing materialists. Thoroughgoing materialists are dauntless. Only from the proletarian standpoint can one truthfully reflect the essence of historical progress. The reactionary literature and art of the bourgeoisie and the revisionists present the workers, peasants and soldiers in a distorted form, and they distort reality. This is the inevitable result of the reactionary world outlook of historical idealism on which such literature and art rest. To promote "truthful writing" in the abstract means to oppose the propagation of Mao Tse-tung's thought and the education of the people in the communist spirit through literature and art. It means negating and covering up the class character of literature and art, and seeking a "theoretical" basis for noxious weeds which glamorize the exploiting classes and defame the proletariat. It is the rottenest muck in the bourgeois armoury of literature and art.

"One may look at both the good and the bad aspect . . . it is permissible for literary and artistic works to describe shortcomings. This is the theory of "exposure of the dark side," a reproduction of the reactionary theory of laying "equal stress on the bright and the dark, half and half," which Chairman Mao condemned long ago. We should distinguish between the main current and the minor currents of life. Only when we focus on the main current can we give a typical presentation of the essence of social advance. Minor currents merely offer a contrast to the main current and can be used as means to present the essence, forming a subordinate aspect of the whole, partial and temporary twists in the course of advance, never to be regarded as the main content of life. We should centre our efforts mainly on writing about the bright, on praising our great victories in socialist revolution and socialist construction, that is, praising the triumph of Mao Tse-tung's thought, on presenting the world-shaking heroism and wisdom of proletarian revolutionary fighters in the struggle, on portraying the heroic workers, peasants and soldiers of our era and not on presenting the "good side" and the "bad side," half and half. To exaggerate, play up and build vicious fabrication upon partial, isolated phenomena is the old tune the imperialists, the revisionists and the bourgeoisie harp on in their rumour-mongering and slanders, and this veteran Rightist apes them. Is it necessary to avoid contradiction in devoting our main effort to praising the bright? Is it necessary to avoid talking of the enemy's struggles and counter-attacks? Is it necessary to tone down sharp conflicts? No, it is not. Society advances through class struggle. The revolutionary forces of the pro-

letariat invariably blaze their way forward in fierce struggle with the counter-revolutionary forces of the bourgeoisie. Only by making typical historical generalizations about class contradictions and class struggles can the bright, the victorious and the heroic be portrayed in all their depth and grandeur, and not superficially and feebly. The revolutionary people will sweep Tao Chu's theory of the "exposure of the dark side" into the dustbin of history, along with his dark soul.

See Through the Khrushchov-type Careerists

From the several aspects mentioned above, people can easily see that Tao Chu is nothing but a big Rightist who managed to slip out of the net, a revisionist, a loyal executant and propagandist of the reactionary bourgeois line represented by China's Khrushchov, a counter-revolutionary double-dealer who sneaked into the Party. The reactionary system of Kuomintang philosophy and the other germs spread by his books must be thoroughly wiped out.

Tao Chu is a careerist of the Khrushchov type. He sticks stubbornly to the capitalist political orientation. He bitterly hates socialism and hankers after capitalism day and night. His "ideals" in politics, culture and life are nothing but a capitalist restoration in China. His head is stuffed with the reactionary world outlook of the exploiting classes, such as the philosophy of traitors and the idea of "the scholar dies for his bosom friend." However, in his efforts not to be exposed under the dictatorship of the proletariat, he cannot but disguise himself in a revolutionary cloak. This fellow is extremely crooked. He is a double-dealer who talks big, now eloquent and now insinuating; such is his familiar performance. But on the fundamental question of which road to take, the socialist or the capitalist road, he can be promptly stripped of his disguise and his true features can be laid bare when he is brought before the magic mirror of Mao Tse-tung's thought. Aren't these two books ironclad proof of his taking the capitalist road?

All careerists of the Khrushchov type are conspiratorial usurpers of Party leadership. In order to oppose the proletarian headquarters headed by Chairman Mao, oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought and oppose the proletarian revolutionaries, they resort to all kinds of tricks and intrigues to expand the power held by a handful of revisionists and they shamelessly boost themselves. Tao Chu came out with these two books not only to prepare public opinion for a capitalist restoration, but also as a means of expanding the power held by a handful of revisionists like himself. He intended to use these books to prepare public opinion for the seizure of power from the proletarian headquarters. When

Tao Chu came from his regional post to the central organ of leadership, he extended his reach so far and wide and within a few months exposed his maniac desire to seize power from the proletariat so strikingly, stopping at nothing in recruiting deserters and turncoats, buying over bad elements who had already been exposed by the revolutionary people, opposing the Central Committee of the Party headed by Chairman Mao and attacking the revolutionaries, that none of his double-dealing tricks could cover up his counter-revolutionary ambition any longer. Can we not draw an important lesson from this negative example and learn how to see through persons of the Khrushchov type?

Tao Chu is a despicable pragmatist. He has the speculator's glib talk. In order to peddle revisionism and to oppose and attack what he called dogmatism—actually Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought—he appeared as an ultra-Rightist one minute and on the extreme "Left" the next. In this way, he corrupted, confused and hoodwinked those who waver in the middle of the road, so as to protect himself from being exposed. After he took charge of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee, Tao Chu became the faithful agent of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road in suppressing the revolutionary masses. He did his utmost to oppose Chairman Mao's great big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters." He tried his best to protect the monsters. But when the masses rose to criticize and repudiate the bourgeois reactionary line, with a twist of the body he made a sudden change and appeared in the guise of an ultra "Left" anarchist. He shouted himself hoarse that "in the great cultural revolution, it is correct to doubt everyone and everything." "I am all for bombardment in general. . . nobody knows what the headquarters really represent, and that goes for every headquarters." "You can oppose anybody." He "creatively" developed the bourgeois reactionary line of "hitting hard at the many in order to protect a handful." He appeared to be surprisingly "Left," but in fact he was "Left" in form and Right in essence. His purpose was to blur the distinction between the proletarian headquarters and the bourgeois headquarters, and direct the spearhead of attack at the proletarian headquarters headed by Chairman Mao so that the handful of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road could sneak away in the confusion. "To doubt everyone and everything" and the like are designed to deal with the proletarian headquarters. "To doubt everyone and everything" except himself, "to overthrow everyone" except himself—isn't there something fishy here? Comrades, please note that there are now a handful of counter-revolutionaries who are adopting the same method. Using slogans that sound extremely "Left" but in essence are extremely Right, they have stirred up evil gusts of "doubting everyone," while bombarding the prole-

tarian headquarters, creating dissension and exploiting confusion. To achieve their sinister ulterior aim, they have vainly attempted to shake and split the proletarian headquarters headed by Chairman Mao. The organizers and manipulators of the so-called "May 16" group are just such a scheming counter-revolutionary gang. It must be thoroughly exposed.

The deepening of the class struggle and the victories of the proletarian revolutionaries compel the enemies constantly to change their tactics of struggle. When one counter-revolutionary scheme of theirs is seen through, they resort to another and they use these devices alternately. But these degenerates can never escape detection by Mao Tse-tung's thought which discovers the minutest detail in everything. In the present victorious situation, we must give full attention to the general orientation of the struggle, to safeguarding the proletarian headquarters headed by Chairman Mao, to carrying through the unified plan for battle decided upon by Chairman Mao and the Central Committee of the Party, to mastering policies and tactics, to uniting the great majority and to preventing such characters as Tao Chu from creating confusion in our ranks, from either the Right, or the "Left," or both sides simultaneously. When the forces of the Left make mistakes, the forces of the Right exploit them. This has always been so. In the current movement of mass criticism and repudiation, we should arrive at a still deeper understanding of this fact by summing up the historical experience of class struggle.

The great proletarian cultural revolution is surging forward like a mighty torrent. The brilliant rays of Mao Tse-tung's thought are lighting up all China and the entire world. China's proletarian revolutionaries and revolutionary people are courageous. We are determined to carry this great revolution through to the end. The counter-offensives, attacks, rumours and sowing of discord by the handful of capitalist roaders in authority, and all the different kinds of slander, distortion, vilification and clamour coming from the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the modern revisionists, definitely cannot prevent our advance but will only prove these same persons to be thoroughly stupid and at the end of their tether. Comrades, let us raise our hands and hail this great storm which is cleansing the vast land of China! Mao Tse-tung's thought is invincible. The people's strength is inexhaustible. What is new-born and revolutionary is irresistible. People will see that, after traversing the magnificent and tortuous path of the great cultural revolution, a great socialist China under the dictatorship of the proletariat, unprecedentedly strong, consolidated and unified, will tower in the East like a giant and deal still heavier blows at the cannibals of the 20th century.

(Slightly abridged)